REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Prior to entry of this response, Claims 1-3, 7-8, 10-14, 16-19, 21, and 24-27 were pending in the application, of which Claims 1, 10, 19, and 27 are independent. In the Office Action dated April 29, 2008, Claims 1-3, 7-8, 10-14, 16-19, 21, and 24-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Following this response, Claims 1-3, 7-8, 10-14, 16-19, 21, and 24-27 remain in this application. Applicants hereby address the Examiner's rejections in turn.

I.   Interview Summary

Applicants thank Examiner Rutledge for the courtesy of a telephone interview on August 5, 2008, requested by the undersigned to discuss the rejection of the current claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103. During the interview, the Examiner indicated that while the claims as amended overcome the cited reference, further searching would be necessary. The Examiner further indicated that the Information Disclosure Statements filed on November 8, 2004, October 17, 2007, November 29, 2007, and December 19, 2007 will be reviewed and reconsidered with the submission of this Amendment. The Examiner indicated that a legible copy of the Information Disclosure Statements filed on June 25, 2007, July 27, 2007, and September 27, 2007 can be submitted with this Amendment. The legible Information Disclosure Statements will be reviewed and reconsidered with the submission of this Amendment. No agreement was reached regarding patentability.

II.   Change to Attorney Docket Number

Please note that the Attorney Docket Number for this application is now
60001.0112US01/MS#149368.1.

III.   Rejection of the Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action dated April 29, 2008, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-3, 7-8,
10-14, 16-19, 21, and 24-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S.
Patent No. 5,974,413 ("*Beauregard*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,976,209 B1
("*Storisteanu*"). Independent Claims 1, 10, 19, and 27 have been amended, and
Applicants respectfully submit that these amendments overcome this rejection and add
no new matter.

Amended Claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the
reason that it recites, for example, "annotating the string of text comprises breaking the
string of text by each of the at least one recognizer plug-in." Amended Claims 10, 19
and 27 each includes a similar recitation. Support for these amendments can be found
in the specification at least on page 11, lines 13-31.

In contrast, *Beauregard* at least does not teach or suggest the aforementioned
recitation. For example, *Beauregard* merely discloses that a semantic user interface
(SUI) makes a computer responsive to a user's every word. (*See* col. 5, lines 12-13.)
Beauregard works with and independently of any software application. (*See* Col. 5,
lines 51-54.) In *Beauregard*, the user can create multiple profiles by turning
applications, drawers and/or folder on/off and by assigning priorities to each of the

drawer/folder combinations. (*See* col. 25, lines 27-29.) Accordingly *Beauregard* does not teach that each recognizer plug-in being responsible for breaking up a string of text. Rather, *Beauregard* teaches that a semantic user interface is responsive to a user's every word and that the user can create multiple profiles.

Furthermore, *Storisteanu* does not overcome *Beauregard's* deficiencies. For example, *Storisteanu* states that a routine markDeleteNotification is provided for adding a specified mark to a document mark-deleted notifications pending list. (*See* col. 17, lines 53-55.) *Storisteanu* further states that a routine markChangesNotification is provided for adding a specified mark, if not yet changed, to a document mark-changed notifications pending list. (*See* col. 18, lines 1-3.) Like *Beauregard*, *Storisteanu* at least does not teach or suggest that each recognizer plug-in being responsible for breaking up a string of text. Rather, *Storisteanu* merely discloses routines provided for adding a specified mark to a specified document notification pending list.

Combining *Beauregard* with *Storisteanu* would not have led to the claimed invention because *Beauregard* and *Storisteanu,* either individually or in combination, at least do not disclose or suggest "annotating the string of text comprises breaking the string of text by each of the at least one recognizer plug-in," as recited by amended Claim 1. Amended Claims 10, 19 and 27 each includes a similar recitation. Accordingly, independent Claims 1, 10, 19, and 27 each patentably distinguishes the present invention over the cited art, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of Claim 1, 10, 19 and 27.

Dependent Claims 2-3, 7-8, 11-14, 16-18, 21, and 24-26 are also allowable at least for the reasons described above regarding independent Claims 1, 10, and 19, and by virtue of their respective dependencies upon independent Claims 1, 10, and 19. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 2-3, 7-8, 11-14, 16-18, 21, and 24-26.

IV.   Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims. The preceding arguments are based only on the arguments in the Office Action, and therefore do not address patentable aspects of the invention that were not addressed by the Examiner in the Office Action. The claims may include other elements that are not shown, taught, or suggested by the cited art. Accordingly, the preceding argument in favor of patentability is advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability. Furthermore, the Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this amendment and charge any additional required fees to our Deposit Account No. 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.

P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
404.954.5066

Date: August 29, 2008   /D. Kent Stier/
                          D. Kent Stier
                          Reg. No. 50,640

DKS:wp:ak

27488
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE